

REMARKS

In the final Office Action dated August 20, 2008 it is noted that claims 1-11 are pending.

Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended herein to clarify the subject matter. According to applicant's claimed invention there is no redundant route for IP packets therefore, management information of a mobile station is kept by a related terminal node. Thus, other terminal nodes do not keep the management information of the mobile station. No new matter is entered.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Willars et al. US 7,072,329 (hereinafter Willars). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Willars fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature.

For example, claim 1 in part recites: "there is no redundant routes for IP packet flow to each terminal node" and "each of the plurality of terminal nodes retains respective management information of a mobile station so that the management information of the mobile station is kept by only one related terminal node."

Willars shows the redundant routes through at least link 29 and the interworking node/function providing a connection between a ATM node and an IP node, so as to connect therebetween, and providing address changing or tunneling via the inter-working node.

In the Response to Arguments section of the final Office action it is asserted in paragraph 19 that link 29 of Willars does not handle data/voice traffic. Applicant respectfully disagrees. One skilled in the art upon reading Willars, for example col. 4, lines 4-15, col. 8, lines 21-30, col. 10, lines 44-61 would understand that Link 29 relates to the Iur as described in the RAN structure according to 3GPP, for example section 4.4 of the specification document 25.420. According to these specifications the link 29 is an interface through which signals including user data flow. In contrast, according to the claimed invention there is no redundant routes for IP packets to each terminal node.

Willars Figs. 2A-2C and the corresponding descriptions, for example col. 8, lines 44-46, shows that the RNC nodes are connected to each other by link 29. Willars also

describes that the Interworking function having both the ATM and IP interfaces for connecting the RNC nodes. Therefore, Willars fails to teach or suggests the tree-shape connection structure having a network structure in which there is no redundant routes for IP packet flow to each terminal node.

Thus, Willars fails to teach or suggest at least the above mentioned features of independent claim 1.

Claims 2-7 are dependent upon claim 1 and inherit at least the above distinguishing features not found in Willars and are therefore also allowable.

Independent claims 8 and 9, while different from claim 1, each includes at least the above distinguishing features similar to claim 1. Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments pointing out why claims 8 and 9 are not anticipated by Willars.

Applicant's claim 10 depends from claim 9 and inherits all the features of the base claim.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 8-10 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 11, while different from claim 1, includes at least the above distinguishing features similar to claim 1. Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments pointing out why claim 11 is not anticipated by Willars. Furthermore, broadcasting of packets is performed at a node disposed on the superordinate side in the hierarchy.

As pointed out above the interworking as disclosed in Willars is completely different from the claimed invention recited in claims 1-11 and the rejection under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of at least the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-3894.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/
Brian S. Myers
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 61650

Telephone: (973) 401-7157 or (551) 265-7793

Fax: (212) 659-0424

Docket No.: FJHD 32